

REMARKS

Claims 1-13, 15-22, and 24-26 are currently pending in the application. No claims have been added or canceled. Claims 1, 19, and 26 have been amended. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1-13, 15-22, and 24-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0086295 (“Cunningham”). Cunningham discloses a method of transmitting asynchronous hypertext messages from a server to a client interconnected by an internet. The method includes transmitting an HTTP request identifying the client to the server and initiating a virtual connection from the client to the server. The server then transmits a HTTP header signifying a large HTML document, “fooling” a client web browser into keeping the HTTP port open. Asynchronous hypertext messages encoded into HTML documents may then be transferred from the server to the client. The transferred data may then be viewed in a web browser.

Independent claim 1 is directed to a method for providing security to a client computing system in communication with a host communication system across a network. Independent claim 12 is directed to a system for providing security to a client computing system operating a browser in communication with an already loaded interactive software application maintained by a host computing system. Independent claim 19 is directed to a method for providing security to a client computing system operating an already loaded interactive software application. Independent claim 26 is directed to a system for providing security to a client computing system in communication with a host communication system across a network.

Applicant respectfully submits that Cunningham fails to teach or suggest at least two of the distinguishing features common to each of these independent claims, namely: (1) at least one element that is *outside the browser* operating on the client computing system and includes a component of an underlying architecture of the client computing system; and (2) a communication, which *does not pass through the client side firewall*, between an already loaded interactive software application and the at least one element. Applicant respectfully notes that the above-listed claim features require that an interactive software application that has already been loaded in the browser communicate with at least one element located on the client side of the firewall but outside the browser.

The Office Action asserts that the feature of the at least one element being outside the browser operating on the client computing system and including a component of an underlying architecture of the client computing system is taught by Cunningham. However, in the Examiner-cited paragraphs, Cunningham discloses a client JAVA applet receiving data from a server and the JAVA applet then formatting the data to display the message/information in a browser window. The data referred to is a message encoded in an HTML document that the client requests and receives (paragraph 0050). Likewise, paragraphs 0010-0013 of Cunningham disclose HTML information being transmitted over the internet and received by a client. Throughout this process of communicating HTML files, the JAVA applet of Cunningham is relying on the web browser security sandbox for security, and therefore communicates *exclusively within the web browser.*

In contrast to Cunningham, the above-described features of claims 1, 12, 19, and 26 are directed to the ability of an already loaded interactive software application to securely communicate with at least one element outside the web browser. The manner of communication entails a secure communication with *something outside* the web browser. Because the at least one element as claimed is outside of the web browser's domain of protection, there is no reliance on the web browser security sandbox for security protection. Applicant respectfully submits that unlike claims 1, 12, 19, and 26, Cunningham communicates inside the web browser. Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. 102(e) rejection of claims 1, 12, 19, and 26 be withdrawn.

Applicant additionally respectfully submits that the cited portions of Cunningham fail to disclose a communication between the already loaded interactive software application and at least one element that does not pass through the client side firewall. Cunningham discloses communicating hypertext messages by manipulating the HTTP port in order to transmit a message through a firewall, while keeping the port between a server and a client open for real time messages by "fooling" the web browser into believing a large HTML file is being transferred. Towards that end, messages are encoded into HTML files. Because the communication utilizes the HTTP port, firewalls by default permit the messages to penetrate the firewall.

Applicant respectfully submits that the solution of Cunningham is to "sneak" a message through a firewall in order to avoid common firewall blocking techniques, while a solution of

various embodiments of the invention is to eliminate the need to penetrate a firewall at all. The already loaded interactive software application as claimed in claims 1, 12, 19, and 26 allows communication between server-side components in a web browser and client-side components outside the web browser. Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 12, 19, and 26 distinguish over Cunningham and requests that the 35 U.S.C. 102(e) rejection of claims 1, 12, 19, and 26 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 2-11 depend from and further restrict independent claim 1 in a patentable sense. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the rejection of independent claim 1, dependent claims 2-11 distinguish over Cunningham and are in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 2-11 is respectfully requested.

Dependent claims 13 and 15-18 depend from and further restrict independent claim 12 in a patentable sense. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the rejection of independent claim 12, dependent claims 13 and 15-18 distinguish over Cunningham and are in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 13 and 15-18 is respectfully requested.

Dependent claims 20-22 and 24-25 a depend from and further restrict independent claim 19 in a patentable sense. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the rejection of independent claim 19, dependent claims 20-22 and 24-25 distinguish over Cunningham and are in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 20-22 and 24-25 is respectfully requested.

Applicant appreciates the courtesies extended by the Examiner in the recent telephonic interview. During the interview, Applicant's representative and the Examiner discussed various distinguishing features of the claimed invention relative to the cited references. the general thrust of the arguments presented are in accordance with this response.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Dated:

Aug. 23, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By

Ross T. Robinson

Registration No.: 47,031

JENKENS & GILCHRIST, A PROFESSIONAL
CORPORATION

1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 3700

Dallas, Texas 75202

(214) 855-4500

Attorneys For Applicant